United Nations A/64/494

General Assembly

Distr.: General
19 October 2009

Original: English

Sixty-fourth session
Agenda items 10, 33, 108, 114 and 120

Report of the Peacebuilding Commission

Comprehensive review of the whole question of peacekeeping operations in all their aspects

Report of the Secretary-General on the Peacebuilding Fund

Follow-up to the outcome of the Millennium Summit

Strengthening of the United Nations system

Letter dated 7 October 2009 from the Permanent Representative of Switzerland to the United Nations addressed to the President of the General Assembly

I have the honour to enclose herewith a letter addressed to United Nations Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon concerning the outcome of the 3C Conference on Improving Results in Fragile and Conflict Situations, held on 19 and 20 March 2009 in Geneva, Switzerland.

I should be grateful if you have the present letter and its annex circulated as a document of the sixty-fourth session of the General Assembly, under agenda items 10, 33, 108, 114 and 120.

(*Signed*) Peter **Maurer**
Ambassador
Permanent Representative

09-56582 (E) 211009

Please recycle

Annex to the letter dated 7 October 2009 from the Permanent Representative of Switzerland to the United Nations addressed to the President of the General Assembly

I have the honour to transmit herewith the summary of the report on outcomes of the 3C Conference on Improving Results in Fragile and Conflict Situations held on 19 and 20 March 2009 in Geneva, Switzerland (see enclosure I). Along with the Government of Switzerland, the United Nations, the World Bank, the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) acted as co-convenors of the conference. The enthusiasm and support for the 3C Conference and for its follow-up so far have exceeded expectations, with a number of participating countries and intergovernmental organizations committed to the follow-up of recommendations outlined in the 3C Roadmap (see enclosure II).

The 3C Roadmap contains recommendations and agreed language jointly developed by various policy communities, States and international organizations, while taking into account the views of partner countries to improve results in fragile and conflict situations. It is intended to reinforce related ongoing international processes, such as those led by the United Nations, the World Bank, OECD and NATO, and to promote synergy among them.

(*Signed*) Peter **Maurer**
Ambassador
Permanent Representative

Enclosure I

Coherent Coordinated Complementary — 3C Conference on Improving Results in Fragile and Conflict Situations held on 19-20 March 2009 in Geneva, Switzerland

Why this conference?

According to the United Nations, one-fifth of the world's population — over 1.2 billion people — the poorest of the poor — lives in more than 40 fragile and conflict-affected countries. This situation will only worsen as the fallout of the financial crisis spreads further around the globe. It is imperative that the international community maintain their funding levels, ensure that resources are used more effectively, and allow assistance to deliver enhanced results on the ground. It is clear that the implementation of a 3C approach — an approach that is coherent, coordinated and complementary — is essential to achieving the necessary improvements.

3C is understood as collaborative and mutually reinforcing approaches by international actors and partner countries, including civil society, to increase the efficiency and effectiveness of their support to peace, security and development in situations of conflict and fragility. Main dimensions of a 3C approach are:

- Enhanced strategy policy and operational **coherence**, both among different external actors as well as with partner country policies and priorities;
- Improved **coordination** among all actors involved, both at headquarters and field level;
- Strengthened **complementarities** through a "division of labour".

Main objectives and outcomes

The main objectives achieved at the 3C Conference were to facilitate a frank dialogue across different policy communities; to build on international commitments to promote a more coherent, coordinated and complementary approach in fragile and conflict-affected countries; and — as a concrete step forward — to develop a 3C Roadmap for consolidating whole-of government and whole-of-system initiatives and generating an impetus for their implementation.

The 3C Roadmap (see enclosure II) contains recommendations and agreed language jointly developed by various policy communities, states and international organizations, while taking into account the views of partner countries.

Current trends and challenges

The international community has recognised the importance of collaboration across organisations and policy communities as it is mentioned in the 10 Principles for Good Engagement in Fragile Situations and the Accra Agenda for Action, Paris Declaration, the Action Plan for a Comprehensive Approach in the Good Humanitarian Donorship Initiative, and the United Nations Integrated Approach to Crisis and Post-Crisis Situations.

The 3C Roadmap is intended to reinforce related ongoing international processes, such as those led by the 3C Conference co-convenors, the United Nations, the World Bank, the OECD and NATO, and to promote synergy amongst them.

3C Roadmap Principles

A coherent, coordinated and complementary (3C) approach is needed to improve the effectiveness of support to countries and communities affected by conflict and fragility. Against this background, the Conference agreed that the following principles should be given particular attention:

1. Strengthening national ownership and national capacities;
2. Responding in a timely and appropriate manner to the evolving situation in the partner country;
3. Strengthening mutual accountability of partner countries and international actors;
4. Reducing the burden of aid management on partner country capacity;
5. Making efficient use of limited resources and avoiding duplication and funding gaps;
6. Improving and deepening joint learning, and increasing response capacities.

The way forward

The dialogue and collaboration across policy communities must continue. The international community should continue its reflections on how to function in a more coherent, coordinated and complementary way with renewed vigour. It should also push for the further implementation of concrete recommendations and commitments from the 3C Roadmap and aim to systematically include the different policy communities in relevant discussions while also promoting country ownership and fostering local capacities for peace and sustainable development.

Enclosure II

[Original: English, French and Russian]

3C Roadmap

Improving results in conflict and fragile situations

The 3C Conference, meeting in Geneva on 19-20 March 2009, brought together members of the defence, development, diplomatic, finance and economic, humanitarian, and justice and police communities.

The Conference:

1. *Reaffirmed* individual and collective responsibilities for the advancement of stable, effective and accountable states, as well as of long-term sustainable peace, security, development and human rights, in conflict and fragile situations;
2. *Emphasised* that it is crucial to address the nexus between peace, security, human rights and development, to help prevent conflict and to successfully achieve recovery, state-building and peacebuilding objectives, and to address the root causes of conflicts;
3. *Recognised* that the international response in fragile and conflict situations would benefit from increased coherence, coordination and complementarity between actors responsible for defence, diplomatic, justice, finance and economic affairs as well as development and, where appropriate, humanitarian assistance and others; this would increase the effectiveness and efficiency of the support provided by the international community;
4. *Recognised* also that this need for increased coherence, coordination and complementarity calls for improved approaches by both bilateral donors (whole-of-government approaches) and multilateral actors (whole-of-system approaches); noting further that a whole-of-government approach should also be implemented as much as possible by partner countries' governments;[1]
5. *Reaffirmed* the humanitarian principles of humanity, neutrality, impartiality and independence, and *reiterated* that independence means the autonomy of humanitarian objectives from political, economic, military or other objectives;
6. *Stressed* that, where governments demonstrate the political will to foster peace, security, human rights and development, the international community should seek to align with partner countries' national strategies and priorities to address the challenges of fragility and conflict;
7. *Recognised* in this connection the importance of the national budget as a tool for the partner government for setting priorities, coordinating actions and accounting for results;
8. *Recalled and underlined* the importance of existing political commitments[1] that underpin a 3C approach and recognized the importance of the many practical steps[2] already adopted by participants to encourage a 3C approach;

The Conference reached the following conclusions and recommendations, referred to as the 3C Roadmap:

3C Principles

A coherent, coordinated and complementary (3C) approach is needed to improve the effectiveness of support to countries and communities affected by conflict and fragility. Coherence, coordination and complementarity require both whole-of-government and whole-of-system approaches. 3C is understood as collaborative and mutually reinforcing approaches by international actors and partner countries, including civil society, to increase the efficiency and effectiveness of their support to peace, security, and development in situations of conflict and fragility. The 3C Roadmap is intended to reinforce related ongoing international processes, such as those led

[1] The term "partner country" in this document is used to designate countries in situations of fragility and/or conflict.

by the 3C conference co-convenors, the UN, the WB, the OECD and NATO, and to promote synergy amongst them.

Against this background, the Conference agreed that the following principles should be given particular attention:

1. Strengthening national ownership and national capacities;
2. Responding in a timely and appropriate manner to the evolving situation in the partner country;
3. Strengthening mutual accountability of partner countries and international actors;
4. Reducing the burden of aid management on partner country capacity;
5. Making efficient use of limited resources and avoiding duplication and funding gaps;
6. Improving and deepening joint learning, and increasing response capacities.

Recommendations

The conference encouraged all parties to strive to implement the following recommendations in order to achieve coherent, coordinated and complementary (3C) approaches in conflict and fragile situations:

1. *To strengthen national ownership and national capacities*

   a) Systematically associate partner countries' authorities and relevant stakeholders at all levels, including civil society, in assessing needs, in analysing root causes of conflict and fragility, and in identifying priorities to strengthen national and local ownership and in contributing to confidence building and reconciliation.

   b) Give priority to strengthening partner countries' institutions and capacities at all levels, including the local level; to enable the state to fulfil its core functions. Priority functions include: ensuring security and justice, mobilising revenue and managing budget and public finances, establishing an enabling environment for basic service delivery, strong economic performance and employment generation. Support to these areas will in turn strengthen citizens' confidence, trust and engagement with state institutions. Civil society has a key role both in demanding good governance and in service delivery.

2. *To respond in a timely and appropriate manner to the evolving situation in the partner country:*

   a) Encourage regularly updated joint assessments and analysis of the evolving situation, challenges and trends, including crisis and risks dynamics. These joint assessments should initially be as light and rapid as possible, including partner countries wherever appropriate, and progressively become more comprehensive. They should involve those responsible for security, political and economic affairs, as well as those responsible for development and humanitarian assistance and other policy areas, as appropriate.

   b) Using these assessments as a basis, partner countries and international actors, as appropriate, should develop shared and realistic peace-building, state-building and recovery objectives that are sensitive to the changing environment, as well as strategies that address the root causes of conflict and fragility and help ensure the protection and the participation of the population. These strategies should promote gender equality, social inclusion and human rights; and should progressively be adjusted to the evolving situation. The critical path of priority actions, their sequencing and how they mutually reinforce each other should be identified at the outset, with enough flexibility for periodical readjustment. They should make use of the comparative advantages of all different actors, while preserving the humanity, independence, neutrality and impartiality of humanitarian aid. In this context, where a peace operation with a Security Council mandate has deployed, ensure that it is part of a whole of system approach to peacebuilding which helps to create the conditions for a sustainable and lasting peace. The positive socio-economic impact of the peace operations should be optimised, taking into account their security objectives.

c) Foster the use of shared tools and methodologies for assessment, planning, monitoring and evaluation which address the needs of all actors to encourage coherence, coordination and complementarity.

d) The international community, as a matter of priority, should deploy demand-driven resources in support of local capacities, wherever possible; it also should stand ready to provide direct support for the delivery of priority activities for critical state functions and for early and sustained recovery when national capacity is seriously lacking, mindful of the need to systematically support national implementation capacity and rely upon it increasingly as it develops. It also should foster the development of capacities at the international level that can support state- and peace-building objectives; in some cases this requires building new capacities to tackle these complex tasks, in others it is about recognising where those capacities currently exist and providing adequate training.

3. *To strengthen the mutual accountability of partner countries and the international community:*

a) Maintain a continuous dialogue between the partner country and the international community to ensure that their shared objectives are reflected in appropriate mutual accountability mechanisms where relevant, such as comprehensive frameworks detailing actions and resources required, associated with mutually endorsed benchmarks, and submitted to regular mutual assessment reviews.

b) Where governments demonstrate the political will to foster peace, security, human rights and development, but lack capacity, the international community should seek to align assistance with country strategies. Where this is not possible because of particularly weak governance or violent conflict, they should seek opportunities to maximise alignment with plans developed in a participatory and inclusive manner at the sectoral or regional level.

c) Donor agencies, including multilateral agencies, should ensure full transparency in their support, including funding through non-government channels. Partner countries' governments should ensure full transparency in the national budgets and in the use of national resources.

4. *To reduce the burden of aid management on partner countries capacities:*

a) Simplify and harmonise aid management to the extent possible, by reducing the number of aid coordination mechanisms and aid channels, and agreeing common business practices. Each donor should try to adapt its representation in the field in line with partner countries' needs, and define clear lines of authority for its various activities; practical approaches could take the form of joint offices, agreed division of labour, delegated cooperation agreements, multi-donor trust-funds and common reporting and financial requirements.

b) Recognising the critical role of the United Nations in conflict and fragile situations, clarify in the context of the ongoing reform processes, the division of roles and responsibilities within the UN, and between the UN, the international financial institutions and other donors, to ensure a coherent and coordinated approach.

5. *To make efficient use of limited resources, to avoid duplication and funding gaps:*

a) Provide flexible, rapid and predictable long-term funding, including pooled funding where appropriate; funding should be adequate and commensurate with pledges made, and be made available in a timely manner to sustain progress in stabilisation and address recovery and peacebuilding needs.

b) Develop and maintain a clear understanding of all commitments and investments made, as well as of all capacities available at both the national and international community ends, with a view to optimising their utilisation, based on comparative advantages, identifying clear but sometimes shifting priorities, and aiming to avoid duplication of efforts and to bridge critical gaps.

6. *To improve and deepen our joint learning and increase our capacities:*

a) Promote more systematic joint learning, training and capacity development activities across agencies within donor governments, as well as among the various international organisations operating in conflict and fragile situations; in this context, the insights gained and best practices identified by relevant international, regional and sub-regional organisations and bodies should be promoted and

disseminated; moreover, the expertise of the international, national and local civil society should be fully mobilised.

b) Carry out joint monitoring and evaluation of activities, including real-time evaluations, more systematically, to the extent possible; these joint efforts should involve all relevant departments/ministries/agencies of both the international community — bilateral donors as well as international organisations — the partner country and its civil society as appropriate; they should also ensure that the respective perspectives of all these actors are duly taken into account, and reflect the partner country's priorities and strategies.

Follow-up

The Conference invited all participants to take this agenda forward in accordance with their individual mandates. The chair will bring the outcomes of the 3C meeting to the attention of the different policy communities represented, with a view to taking this agenda forward through all relevant ongoing international processes, including in the follow-up to the UN SG's report on "Peacebuilding in the immediate aftermath of conflict" and in OECD's implementation of the Ministerial Declaration on Policy Coherence for Development.

A number of participants also entered into individual and joint commitments in support of these principles and recommendations. A consolidated list of these commitments will be made available with the conference report, and would subsequently be annexed to the Roadmap.

The Conference also agreed that stock should be taken of individual and collective efforts made and results obtained in these areas by 2011, in a way to be determined.

The 3C Roadmap was adopted at the 3C Conference 2009 on a coherent, coordinated, complementary approach in situations of conflict and fragility, 19-20 March 2009, Geneva, Switzerland, www.3C-Conference2009.ch.

---

[1] Existing commitments include but are not limited to:

- The UN 2005 World Summit Outcome, acknowledging the interlinkage of peace and security, development and human rights, and emphasising the need for a coordinated, coherent and integrated approach to post-conflict peacebuilding and reconciliation with a view to achieving sustainable peace (A/RES/60/1 para. 9 and para. 97)
- The civil-military coordination, including as set forward in the March 2003 Guidelines on the Use of Military and Civil Defence Assets to support UN Humanitarian Activities in Complex Emergencies and the "Civil-Military Guidelines and Reference for Complex Emergencies" endorsed by the IASC in 2008
- The Paris Declaration for Aid Effectiveness (2005) and the Accra Agenda for Action (paragraph 21) (2008)
- OECD Ministerial Policy Commitment to improve development effectiveness in fragile states (DCD/DAC(2007)29), OECD DAC Principles for Good International Engagement in Fragile States and Situations (DAC/DCD(2007)29) and OECD Ministerial Statement on Security System Reform (2007)
- OECD Ministerial Declaration on Policy Coherence for Development (approved by Ministers of OECD countries at the Ministerial Council, on 4 June 2008)
- The Good Humanitarian Donorship Initiative
- 2007 European Council Conclusions on Fragile Situations, and 2007 European Council Conclusions on Security and Development

[2] Examples of practical steps already undertaken are:

- The undertaking of thematic meetings in the framework of the OECD-DAC to enhance coordination and complementarity, including whole-of-government/whole-of-system approaches (e.g. Development, Diplomacy and Integrated Planning (11-12 February 2008, Oslo); Whole-of-Government Approaches in Public Financial Management (17-18 March 2008, Paris); Security System Reform (9-10 April 2008, The Hague);
- The International Dialogue with partner countries to define shared statebuilding and peacebuilding objectives launched at the Accra High-Level Forum 2008

- The development of joint frameworks for analysis and mechanisms to facilitate common and coherent understandings of fragile, conflict and post-conflict situations (e.g. Post Conflict Needs Assessments (PCNA) and Transitional Results Frameworks (TRF);
- The promotion of funding and reporting mechanisms to avoid duplication and enhance a complementary approach, including shared standing capacities, multi-donor trust funds and basket/pooled-funding.
- The creation of innovative organisational units and processes that combine civil-military competencies to better respond to the challenges of stability and development under conditions of conflict.
- The follow-up processes on the implementation of the UNSC Resolutions 1325 and 1820 on Women, Peace and Security and UN SC Resolution 1612 on Children in Armed Conflicts.